

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FREDERICK SCHIFF,  
Plaintiff,

v.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,  
et al.,  
Defendants.

No. C-03-4345 MMC  
No. C-04-2261 MMC  
No. C-04-2262 MMC

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY  
SCHIFF AND MANSHARDT  
DECLARATIONS SHOULD NOT BE  
STRICKEN/DISREGARDED**

NARDA GILLESPIE et al.,  
Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,  
et al.,  
Defendants.

MARK OSUNA,  
Plaintiff,

v.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,  
et al.,  
Defendants.

/


1 Before the Court are four separate motions for summary judgment, noticed for  
2 hearing January 13, 2006, and plaintiffs' oppositions thereto.

3 Defendants Fred Lau ("Lau") and the City and County of San Francisco ("City")  
4 correctly note that part of the evidence on which plaintiffs rely has not been properly  
5 submitted to the Court. In particular, Lau objects to the Schiff Declaration, attached to  
6 plaintiffs' joint opposition to Lau's motion for summary judgment, on the ground it is not  
7 signed; the City objects to the Declaration of Frederick Manshardt, cited in plaintiffs' joint  
8 opposition to the City's motion for summary judgment, on the ground said declaration was  
9 neither filed with the Court nor served on the City.

10 Accordingly, plaintiffs are hereby ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE in writing, no later  
11 than January 12, 2005 at 4:00 p.m., why the entirety of such declarations should not be  
12 stricken and/or disregarded by the Court.

13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14 Dated: January 11, 2006

  
MAXINE M. CHESNEY  
United States District Judge